DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 529 EA 009 994

AUTHOR	Deaver, Philip
TITLE	Violence and Vandalism in the Schools: The Problem and How to Address It.
INSTITUTION	Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind. Inst. for Community Education Development.; National Community Education Association, Flint, Mich.; Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	64p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Offices of the National Community Education Association, 1017 Avon Street, Flint, Michigan 48503 ($1.00 plus shipping and handling, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Education; *Crime; Delinquency; Discipline Policy; *Discipline Problems; Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; School Community Relationship; *School Vandalism; Statistical Data; Student School Relationship; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*School Security

ABSTRACT

This paper was prepared by members of the National Community Education Association's Committee on Violence and Vandalism in the Schools as a review of the literally hundreds of pounds of information, research, and news generated on this topic. The purpose of this review is to indicate how community education coordinators and directors can constructively approach these problems. The author outlines the scope, causes, and suggested solutions to the complex problems of vandalism and crime, drawing on the report of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency and other sources. He mentions the difficulty in ascertaining whether the causes for youth crime and violence lie within the schools or within society as a whole. He also briefly summarizes the school security measures taken by some districts, outlines possible long-range process measures to cope with these problems, and delineates community education's potential as a means of solving these problems. Statistics on school vandalism and violence are included. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145529

Violence and Vandalism in the Schools:

the problem and how to address it

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Decker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

prepared by Philip Deaver
from the research of the National
Community Education Association
School Violence Committee

EA 009 994

Printed in the United States of America
by
University of Virginia Printing Office
Charlottesville, Virginia
First Printing, October, 1976
Second Printing, March, 1977

Copies are available through:

Offices of the National Community Education Assoc.
1017 Avon Street
Flint, Michigan 48503
(313) 234-1634

Cost: Free to N.C.E.A. Active Members (1976-77)
All Others: $1.00 - 1 through 9 copies
.80 - 10 through 49 copies
Per Copy .70 - 50 and over
Plus shipping and handling

* * * * * * *

A cooperative publication of

The University of Virginia
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education

The Ball State University
Institute for Community Education Development

The National Community Education Association

NOTE: The cover drawing is reproduced by permission of the Washington Post.

Preface

The establishment of the NCEA Committee on Violence and Vandalism in the Schools came as the result of revelations emerging from the preliminary report on school violence published by the judiciary subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency. One commitment of the committee was to generate a major paper on the subject of violence and vandalism in schools. The purpose of the paper, as stated, was not to demonstrate the significant effect of community education on the problem of vandalism (this work has been done elsewhere) but rather to inform community educators of the scope of the problem, to offer information concerning measures which have been taken to address violence and vandalism in the schools, and finally to provide counsel as to the role a community education coordinator or director might rightly assume in the pursuit of solutions to whatever violence and vandalism problems exist in his specific jurisdiction.

In the year since the Bayh subcommittee report was published, literally hundreds of pounds of information, research and news have been generated on the topic. It was the task of the committee in the preparation of the present paper to review as much of this material as possible and to determine what of it all might be relevant to our purposes here. The task was accomplished, for the most part, by correspondendence, which was somewhat awkward but which provided each individual committee member with an opportunity to make a particularly personal contribution.

In addition to the committee members, several other persons deserve recognition for their efforts in regard to this document. Dr. John Fallon was the NCEA Board Member who facilitated the establishment of this committee. Dr. Larry Decker and his wife, Virginia, lent their editorial talents. Brook Jones typed the final manuscript and also helped editorially. And Dave Torma, Alabama State Department Community Education Specialist, provided considerable information in regard to the national Safe Schools Act. The printing of this document resulted from

the exemplary cooperative effort of the National Community Education Association, the University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education and the Ball State University Institute for Community Education Development.

Because of the demand for this publication, the second printing was accomplished by the NCEA, which also took on the task of distribution. Thanks to you all.

Philip Deaver
Chairperson
NCEA School Violence
Committee
February 14, 1977
Murray, Kentucky

CONTENTS

Preface	i
Introduction	1
Scope of the Problem	7
Bayh Subcommittee Report	7
Regional Statistics	9
Associations Taking Interest	13
Causes of the Problem	18
Societal Causes	19
School Causes	23
Suggested Solutions	34
Suggested Immediate Security Measures	35
Suggested Long-Range Process Measures	39
Community Education and Juvenile Delinquency	45
The Matter of Legislation	49
A Final Comment	51
Notes	53
The NCEA School Violence Committee	56

INTRODUCTION

In April of 1975, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency released the results of its 18-month study on school violence and vandalism. During that spring and throughout the summer, there was a veritable storm of confusion and concern both in the media and in the giant world of public education. The eye of the storm was centered on the central findings of the subcommittee study - that in the three-year period 1970 to 1973, the U. S. taxpayer paid an annual $600 million to repair and replace equipment and facilities vandalized in the nation's schools. Seminars and workshops were held, special publications prepared and a snowball effect was set in motion, in which teachers and administrators finally came forth to publicly discuss the full breadth of violence that seemed to be reigning in the nation's schools. The juvenile delinquency subcommittee (chaired by Birch Bayh, D., Ind.) scheduled several hearings on the topic and heard from a vast range of interested organizations and informed specialists. Information was broadly disseminated, most of it descriptive in nature: so many rapes in

New York schools, so many teacher assaults in Chicago, so many dollars damage in Houston, Philadelphia, Los Angeles; and it was carefully pointed out that the problem was not isolated in cities and suburbs but was also rampant in rural America.

Criminologists, educators and sociologists shared their ideas for solutions. Researchers shared their research. Legislators continued to have hearings and to collect data from everywhere. But the whole storm of interest seemed to have relatively little effect on how things were going in the school year 1975-76; while educators and legislators were collecting data, many schools remained dangerous and uneducative.

There was a persistent minority which continued to say that the whole matter was being blown out of proportion, that the studies were sensationalizing data collected from a relatively few "problem" schools; maintaining that the schools were by and large safe, that the majority of school-aged children felt secure in their public school classrooms, and that education was taking place as usual. The truth was probably somewhere in between. While there could be little doubt that the matter was being blown out of proportion, there also was little doubt that

public education had a big and expensive problem with school crime.

Those who allowed that there was a problem were predictably divided in their thoughts on what to do about it. There were the stop-gappers and the long-range planners; the humanists and the security-hardware types; the punishers and the rehabilitators; those who would brave over-caution to avoid precipitousness and those who would brave precipitousness for an early solution. There were the conservatives and the liberals, the progressives and the traditionalists. There were those who maintained that regional solutions would be better adapted to specific problems and those who believed that one central answer would serve for all. And there were those whose basic topic was money: schools were ill-funded, violence was caused by poverty, solutions were too expensive, the trouble was that there just wasn't enough money--what we needed was more money and then there would be less violence and vandalism.

What seemed to emerge clearly from the storm of confusion and concern was that there was no practical central answer to the problem. School violence and vandalism is a huge problem in itself and, at the same time, are symptoms of problems which reach even

deeper into our societal fabric.

In the first part of this study is a brief report concerning the statistical information available from numerous studies. This information is provided to demonstrate the scope of the problem, as well as to give the community educator a digest of the research that has been generated. Note that much of this research is descriptive; there remains a basic void in the area of diagnostic and remedial research.

The second part of the study discusses causes. Often conflicting in nature, the expert opinions and empirical research on the causes of violence and vandalism should provide insight into the community educator's own local situation.

The third part of the study discusses solutions that have been suggested and tried with a degree of success. The community educator's role in the search for solutions is also discussed. Recommendations are made for action research which community education directors and coordinators, by virtue of their unique position and role, can accomplish toward solutions which will benefit not only community education but all whose lives today are affected by violence and vandalism in the schools of America.

Within the footnotes section, sources are provided, complete with names and addresses of organizations which are, today, struggling to isolate, diagnose and solve facets of this broad problem area.

A note on definitions: violence and vandalism are complex matters to define. In the literature which this study reviews, it was discovered that the bounds of the problem area were often not discussed. In other cases, it was clear that what was classified as vandalism in one study was classified differently or not at all in another. A question that continually came up was the problem of where school violence or school crime stops and regular old street crime or violence begins. For instance, in Detroit, two adult males strolled into a high school cafeteria and robbed the cashier of $1,300. Was that school crime? Or was it crime in the community which happened to take place in the school? It matters, because a set of statistics from one school system may classify it differently than another, which frustrates attempts to acquire accurate national data on the problem. Clearly, the definitional problem is merely a surface issue, beneath which are issues of seemingly endless debate. For instance, where does the school's responsibility end in the issue of

juvenile delinquency? At what point are matters of discipline and punishment beyond the jurisdiction of school staff and a matter for local police? Because of definitional problems throughout the problem area being discussed, the following presentation relies on the context of the study being reviewed and on the reader's common sense of language in the matters of definition. These are the same tools our committee had to use in culling the information in the first place.

THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

The following statistics do not tell the whole story of the scope of violence and vandalism in the schools as a national problem. For each rape of a student or teacher and for each assault, there is a psychological cost which filters throughout a student-body, which results in administrative oppression and reaction, and which takes an inestimable toll on the educative climate minimally required in order for public education to occur. It should suffice to say, then, that each statistic below is accompanied by its own real-life horror story, and that it is the compounding of these events into an atmosphere of violence and destruction in the everyday environment of our children which is the major concern.

Bayh Subcommittee Preliminary Report. The subcommittee preliminary report was the result of an 18-month study in which 757 urban, suburban and rural school districts were surveyed for information about school violence and vandalism during the three-year period of 1970 to 1973 (school years). The survey population covered 22 million of the nation's 45 million public school students. The picture which emerged was grim:

- *in 1973, in those 757 schools alone, 100 students were murdered;*

- *over the period 1970-73, there was a 54.4% increase in the number of dangerous weapons being confiscated;*

- *each year, 70,000 teachers were assaulted, and*

- *155,000 teachers had their property maliciously damaged;*

- *$600,000,000 educational dollars each year were sunk into undoing the work of vandals in the schools (which is more than 42 of the 50 states spent on elementary and secondary education in 1972).*

In addition, the subcommittee had learned that:

- *in the period since 1962, juvenile crime increased 246.5%;*

- *at present, persons under 25 commit 50% of all violent crimes and 80% of all property crimes;*

- *to cite one specific case, Philadelphia schools reported 278 students assaulted in 1974, a 38% increase over the previous year.*

- *truancy was higher than ever, especially in urban districts (in fact, because of truancy, plus the problem of dropouts, pushouts, suspensions and expulsions, it was learned that on a given day 13% of the student body in the Washington, D. C. schools is not in class) (the NEA released a 1974 statistic that 2,000,000 school-aged children are not in school at all and that most of them live in the cities).*[1]

From the evidence gathered in hearings and from the survey data, Subcommittee Chairperson Birch Bayh concluded:

> It is alarmingly apparent that school misbehavior and conflict within our school system is no longer limited to a fist fight between individual students or an occasional general disruption resulting from a specific incident. Instead, our schools are experiencing serious crimes of felonious nature, including brutal assaults on teachers and students, as well as rapes, extortions, burglaries, thefts and an unprecedented wave of wanton destruction and vandalism.[2]

The following are the results of the subcommittee survey, along with the regional breakdown of the data:

Regional Breakdown

A. Northeast

Connecticut	New York
Maine	Pennsylvania
Massachusetts	Rhode Island
New Hampshire	Vermont
New Jersey	

(A) Homicide increased by 20.1 percent;
(B) Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 37.9 percent;
(C) Robbery increased by 39.3 percent;
(D) Student assaults on students decreased by 2.2 percent;
(E) Burglary and larceny decreased by 2.9 percent;
(F) Weapons increased by 20.6 percent;
(G) Drugs and alcohol increased by 14.8 percent;
(H) Dropouts increased by 8.0 percent;
(I) Vandalism decreased by 12.0 percent; and
(J) Expulsions decreased by 9.7 percent.

B. Northcentral

Illinois	Missouri
Indiana	Nebraska
Iowa	North Dakota
Kansas	Ohio
Michigan	South Dakota
Minnesota	Wisconsin

(A) Assaults on teachers in schools increased by 52.4 percent;
(B) Assaults on students in schools increased by 20.5 percent;
(C) Number of weapons found in schools increased by 6.7 percent;
(D) Rapes and attempted rapes in schools increased by 60 percent;
(E) Major acts of vandalism increased by 19.5 percent;
(F) Drug and alcohol offenses in schools increased by 97.4 percent, and
(G) Burglaries of school buildings increased by 2.1 percent.

C. South

Alabama
Arkansas
Delaware
Florida
Georgia
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Mississippi
North Carolina
Virgin Islands
Oklahoma
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Virginia
West Virginia
District of Columbia
Puerto Rico

(A) Homicide increased by 25.4 percent;
(B) Rape and attempted rape increased by 28.4 percent;
(C) Robbery increased by 51.7 percent;
(D) Student assault on students increased by 276.9 percent;
(E) Student assault on school personnel increased by 316.4 percent; and
(F) Burglary and larceny increased by 28.1 percent.

D. West

Alaska
Arizona
California
Colorado
Hawaii
Idaho
Montana
Nevada
New Mexico
Oregon
Utah
Washington
Wyoming
Guam
Canal Zone
Trust territories of Pacific & American Samoa

(A) Assaults on students increased 77.4 percent;
(B) Assaults on teachers increased 6.4 percent;
(C) Major acts of vandalism increased by 15.7 percent;
(D) Robberies increased by 98.3 percent;
(E) Burglaries increased by 2.7 percent;
(F) Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 52.3 percent;
(G) Homicides increased by 26.6 percent, and
(H) Drug offenses in schools increased by 18.1 percent.

National Totals

(A) Homicides increased by 18.5 percent;
(B) Rapes and attempted rapes increased by 40.1 percent;
(C) Robberies increased by 36.7 percent;
(D) Assaults on students increased by 85.3 percent;
(E) Assaults on teachers increased by 77.4 percent;
(F) Burglaries of school buildings increased by 11.8 percent;
(G) Drug and alcohol offenses on school property increased by 37.5 percent, and
(H) Dropouts increased by 11.7 percent.[3]

It was this depressing statistical litany, in the spring of 1975, which led to the recent national furor over the state of the nation's public schools. At the end of this study, an address is provided where those who are interested can send for the subcommittee report and depositions from the hearings.

Add to the subcommittee statistics the following items:

- *San Francisco, January, 1975: a Grand Jury determines that "the most serious problem facing the city is the deterioration of its public school system."*

- *January, 1976: a Chicago suburb experiences $10,000 damage in a single week at the hands of vandals;*

- *A Virginia county experienced $306,974.06 worth of vandalism damage in the school year 1974-75, an increase of $67,365.52 (28%) over the previous year;*

- *There were 474 assaults on teachers and staff in the New York City schools in the first five months of the 1974-75 school year;*

- *There was an 85.3 percent increase in assaults on students and a 77.4 percent increase on assaults on teachers between 1970 and 1973;*

- *A Temple University study showed that one quarter of 595 blacks interviewed felt unsafe in school, half felt unsafe on streets near school and more than half of their mothers feared they would be assaulted;*

- *A National Education Association study showed that in the four years 1964 to 1968 the number of assaults on teachers had risen from 135 to 1,065.*[4]

While the amount of data on the problem seems endless, more is being gathered all the time and the statistics are not getting any better. At a time when the education dollar is shrinking, the costs of this crisis situation border on the incalculable. The cost to repair and replace is one matter; but the rough climate of the schools (and the consequent cost for guards and sophisticated security hardware) is drawing dollars out of the instructional and curricular till. And, as mentioned, the cost in dollars may be the least of our worries when compared to the cost to the psyches of our children

and the damage this situation has done to their educational progress.

Associations taking direct interest in the problem. A broad range of associations and organizations came forward in the Bayh subcommittee hearings. Each association and organization had a raft of statistical data to present supporting many general and many very specific notions about the problem of violence and vandalism in the schools.

A spokesperson for the National Committee for Citizens in Education called for "a new kind of parent-educator alliance which goes beyond fancy rhetoric." Further, he called for collaboration between the community, students and educators. "Students in many communities," he said, "now find it possible to observe and help enforce school behavior and policies because they helped develop them."[5]

Mrs. Walter Kimmel, president of the National PTA, also emphasized that the problem is complex and that no solution can be found without the concern and involvement of community leaders, school personnel, parents and students. Further, Mrs. Kimmel pointed out that parents and educators alike must face the fact that 500,000 teen-agers are drinking to excess, that the family unit is under seige, and

that, security hardware notwithstanding, solutions will not be reached before fundamental changes take place in the environment in which children grow up.[6]

Marian Wright Edelman, of the Washington Research Project's Children's Defense Fund, reported on her organization's recent study, which found that "the vast majority of suspensions (as school disciplinary measures) were for nonviolent, nondangerous reasons." Mrs. Edelman called to the attention of the subcommittee a somewhat different kind of violence in the schools -the violence of school systems against children, whether it be in the matter of depriving many children of their right to an education through unnecessary suspensions or in the system's failure to deal effectively with special problems and nonconforming children. The Children's Defense Fund study also revealed that suspensions of blacks and other racial minorities are vastly disproportionate, as in the case of one school district which, at one time or another, had suspended 64% of its black students.[7]

A spokesperson for the New York Civil Liberties Union also defended students, who, he said, were often unfairly blamed for a situation beyond their control. He insisted that "the educational and

social failures of the schools are major contributors to school violence . . . " He cited the abuse of the practice of suspension and expulsion, the practice of tracking "undesirables" into classes in which no learning takes place, and the continuing problem of the school's failure "to afford students the same rights enjoyed by all other persons in our society."[8]

In contrast, Joseph I. Grealy of the National Association of School Security Directors, listed three primary causes of school violence: a natural rise reflecting the rise in adult and juvenile crime in the society; lack of discipline; and hesitancy to recognize, acknowledge and treat the problems of violence and vandalism in the schools. His solutions included the usual security hardware implementation recommendations, installing mobile homes on school sites to ward off vandals in off-hours, and encouraging police patrols of school facilities in off hours.[9]

Robert E. Phay, professor of Public Law at the University of North Carolina, testified in subcommittee hearings that high schools with student populations exceeding 1,200 adolescents become too large to deal with the student as a person. "Thus," he said, "the large urban schools of 3,000 to 4,000

students are programmed for high levels of serious student misconduct and little can be done to avert trouble." Phay also disparaged the use of suspension and expulsion as a disciplinary tool, explaining that these practices only add to the student's academic difficulties and his or her consequent anger or frustration. Like Mrs. Edelman, Phay had evidence that schools with high suspension and expulsion rates also have a high incidence of violence and vandalism. Phay also said that there is very little evidence that students returning from suspension had improved behavior patterns. Phay's major contribution was the recommendation (in detail) for the establishment of conduct codes authored by the students themselves.[10]

In December, 1975, the Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR) centered its fifth annual conference on the topic of violence in schools. Many of those who had appeared before the Bayh subcommittee also spoke at this symposium. The American Association of School Administrators was represented, along with the National Educational Association and the American Federation of Teachers, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and many others. In addition, there were new organizations and associations participating.

Many of the presentations and dialogues of the CEDaR conference were specific and of a problem-solving nature. The National School Boards Association, for instance, presented a statement which insisted that the elementary schools should properly become "family centered institutions," in which parents and educators work together with children at an early age in order to instill values crucial to curbing current societal problems."[11] Many items which were offered there will be presented in the following pages. A major paper was delivered by James McPartland and Edward McDill of the Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. This document serves as a point of departure for the second part of the study, concerned with causes.

CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

Searching for reasons is a difficult matter which often degenerates to a search for someone or some institution to blame. In addition, as we have seen in the brief look at the scope of the problem, school violence and vandalism is a complex, multi-faceted issue charged with the emotions of angry parents, worried administrators, frustrated teachers and confused communities. However, even if the problem of diagnosis is difficult, it is no less necessary.

McPartland and McDill (1975) set out in their study on crime in the schools to discover whether schools play a unique role in the problems of student violence and crime, or whether the problem in schools is more properly attending to factors in the larger society. Ritterband and Silberstein (1973) unhesitatingly concluded from their study that the roots of the problem are in American society, not in failure of the schools. The judiciary subcommittee preliminary report on school violence and vandalism tended in the same direction:

> In a certain sense the American school yard can be viewed as merely a convenient battleground for the overall problem of juvenile crime which has increased by a staggering 245% over the last 13 years.[12]

In their conclusion, McPartland and McDill saw schools as "playing a big part but not of the same magnitude as non-school factors."[13] Their study recommended various reforms, both for schools and the society at large.

Societal Causes. Certainly one of the most frequently mentioned causes for the problem of juvenile delinquency in general, and particularly school crime, is the matter of steadily accelerating family disorganization. Urie Bronfenbrenner, professor of family studies at Cornell, noted: "In terms of such characteristics as the proportion of working mothers, number of adults in the home, single-parent families, or children born out of wedlock, the middle class family of today increasingly resembles the low-income family of the early nineteen sixties."[14] In a cover story discussing this issue, Newsweek reported that the divorce rate is nearing the 50% level (one divorce for every two marriages) in the U. S., with a rapid rising trend in the number of divorces among families with children.[15] Shockingly, the story noted that "in an increasing number of divorce proceedings, neither parent wants the children."[16] Connected to this family disorganization is a myriad of startling developments reflecting the deterioration

of childhood in this country: teen-age drug abuse and child alcoholism are rising at an alarming rate; child abuse is a growing public health problem; the second most common killer of Americans between the age of 15 and 24 is suicide; and each year a million children, mostly middle-class, run away from home.[17]

On the parental side of this picture, according to Margaret Mead, "We have become a society of people who neglect our children, are afraid of children, find children a surplus instead of the raison d'etre of living."[18] Harvard psychologist Jerome Kagan said that parents lack consensus on parenting - how we should discipline our children, what we should do when our children lie. The proliferation of theories on how to parent may signal an eroded confidence in traditional parenting approaches. According to John Anderson, director for the family service in Detroit, the result is that parents often feel overwhelmed by their families.[19]

Bronfenbrenner listed several developments that have evolved in recent decades which have combined to take a toll on our social organization - among them occupational mobility, neighborhood breakdown, the separation of residential from business areas, consolidated business districts, separate patterns of

social life for different age groups, and the delegation of childcare to outside institutions.[20] If such developments as these caused family disorganization, it can be reasonably concluded that they have taken a toll on our schools too.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director of the Center for Studies in Criminiology and Criminal Law and Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, alludes to a subculture of violence, which he says exists in this country. According to him, in poor and deprived areas particularly, the strength and machismo affectation is really the only available area for ego and status. But, he says, other aspects of American culture account for the widespread fascination with violence. In a society, for instance, where family disorganization is bringing about a deprivation of affection in children, and which traditionally has a habit of repressing adolescent sexual behavior, alienation and aggression are bound to rise. Wolfgang points out the inverse relationship between pleasure and violence and insists that a society oriented toward violence will naturally raise children well adapted to violent behavior.[21]

In the Bayh hearings, a spokesperson from the NEA noted that television produces twelve hours of violence which we tolerate, so what's the excitement

about five minutes of rough stuff in a classroom?[22] And it is no secret that television is being indicted by many for its preoccupation with violence. The U. S. Surgeon General's three-year inquiry into the impact of TV violence on children revealed: "The more violence and aggression a child sees on TV, regardless of his age, sex or social background, the more aggressive he is likely to be in his own attitudes and behavior. These effects were not limited to youngsters who are in some way abnormal, but rather were found in large numbers of perfectly normal children."[23]

The deterioration of our entire urban-centered way of life is underscored by the financial crisis of New York City. Just as have many institutions in American society, the cities seem to have grown so large that they can no longer stand. Just as we became fascinated in the last decade by the supposed efficiency of centralizing services, we were, for a long time, fascinated by the prospect of centralizing our population in a few well-placed centers. The result was the creation of a new kind of wilderness, a tangle of semi-efficient services and impossible-to-maintain structures. Just when we seemed on the

threshold of an age of abundance and leisure, we were suddenly back into the age of scarcity and survival.

In searching the horizon for causes of violence and vandalism, the long and difficult issues of poverty and racism are basic considerations. If violence is associated with attitude or with environment, or with family disorganization, then poverty and racism in a capitalist egalitarian society are fundamental anomalies which are with us in 1976, after twelve years of a civil rights movement and a war on poverty.

School Causes. McPartland and McDill suggested a four-category classification of incidents frequently associated with school crime. The first category was "school attacks, thefts, and withdrawals." In this category were included such serious crimes as vandalism, stealing and physical attacks on teachers or other students. Also included in this grouping were high levels of suspensions, absenteeism and reports to the school office. These kinds of incidents, varying in seriousness, have one thing in common, according to McPartland and McDill. They discovered that there was a correlation between persons involved in these kinds of activities and socio-economic

status. "Although a majority of poor students are not free from these problems, attacks on persons and property and withdrawals from school appear to be most frequent and most severe for students and schools from economically depressed families and neighborhoods." [24]

The second category was "drug and alcohol abuse." In this category, the authors reported that "the correlation appears noticeably lower between socio-economic background characteristics with drug or alcohol abuse than with other categories of offenses."[25]

The third category was "student protests and demonstrations," and here the relationship to socio-economics was notably associated with economically and academically advantaged high school student bodies. In this category also, there was no evidence of the same unceasing trend upward that characterized the other categories.[26]

The fourth category was "racial and ethnic tensions." As in the other categories, this one had a separate set of characteristics. McPartland and McDill said that this "may be a special case because it occurs necessarily only in schools with mixed student enrollments, especially where the mix is close

to evenly divided between two identifiable groups." They added that more study must be done on the matter of racial mix and its correlation to tensions and to the other three categories.[27]

McPartland and McDill maintained that school responsiveness may have a direct, independent effect on student offenses, even though they acknowledged that "most of the variance in rates of youthful criminality will be explained by forces that begin with the larger society."[28]

> By responsiveness we mean the degree to which schools take specific notice of changes in student behavior by distributing rewards for improvements in desired behaviors, placing costs on misbehavior and providing access for students in the schools' decision-making procedures.[29]

They isolate the grading system in public schools, the basic way schools respond to (reward) student behavior, in an effort to learn how responsive the grading system is to student behavior and how this system relates to student offenses. They found, first, that a "significant number of individuals continually receive punishments rather than rewards at report card time," no matter what their social deportment might be, indicating that grades are a very unresponsive reward system. Second, they found that a chronic lack of success in school

(grades being the measure) is significantly related to the probability of student disciplinary problems.

> . . . the findings that grades are unresponsive to a significant fraction of students, and these students are the ones more likely to be committing serious offenses in school, indicates that the responsiveness of a school's reward system is a contributing factor to serious student offenses.[30]

Besides looking at the matter of rewards in considering school responsiveness, McPartland and McDill looked at what they termed "costs." Involved in this were how schools (1) make it more difficult to commit an offense, (2) increase the chance that the offender will certainly be caught, (3) enhance the system of handling accused students, or (4) increase the effectiveness of punishments for students who are found guilty.[31] In this area fall various security measures, the matter of school discipline, and the question of if and how schools can handle punishments of offenders. The authors illustrated the importance of the consideration of "cost" by asserting that no cost at all has been rendered a chronic truant by suspending him or her. If suspension is, indeed, a punishment, there is no appropriate cost in it to the student who chronically chooses exclusion from school. The authors recognize that the implications for matching cost to the student being punished, rather than

to the crime, will mean different punishments for different offenders, and would require considerable judgment. It would also reflect considerable responsiveness.

Finally, they consider the matter of responsiveness in schools via "access." Generally, in this area they are speaking of access to the decision-making process, and it is divided into two parts: governing decisions and consumer decisions. Governing decisions involve broad student participation in the setting of rules and codes of behavior. The authors found a highly significant relationship between participation and minimum disciplinary problems. Consumer decisions involve enforcing the rules set in the governing decision making, and by having some say in the matter of academic assignments and classroom directions.[32]

McPartland and McDill's final point is that all of these notions of how schools are organized and how they might be reformed overlook the matter that a school of 1,300 students is a difficult setting for establishing a tone of responsiveness.

In its impersonalness, a big school cannot give as much attention to specific needs and rewards students require. In the anonymity of a large school,

misbehavior can go unnoticed, thus reducing the cost to the student for that misbehavior and encouraging more and broader types of disruptive activity. In addition, on this point, there is considerable evidence that outsiders are responsible for a signifiproportion of the violence taking place during the day. These outsiders may be students who are already expelled, non-students who wander in or students truant from other schools. The anonymity of the large school often serves to camouflage the activities of persons in the school who are not enrolled and who have no business there.

Finally, the large school can hardly provide access to the processes of governing and consumer decision-making which individual students need in order to have a sense of ownership in the tasks and the processes of their schooling. The authors found that the size of a school was positively related to principals' reports of the extent and seriousness of a wide range of student offenses.[33]

The work of McPartland and McDill has been elaborated here because of its breadth, and because of its hard empirical data. Many of the points they make are matters of specialization for other research organizations.

For instance, much ground is being covered in the matter of discipline. There is no debating that this is a problem of major proportions - a 1974 Gallup poll surveyed adults and high school students on their opinion of the major difficulty in schools: lack of discipline. The disagreement came in how that discipline was to be resurrected. Robert Phay strongly recommended the involvement of students in developing student codes, in an effort toward increased school responsiveness by granting access. The NEA says that permissiveness and lax discipline are such problems in the schools that many local NEA associations are demanding firm and enforceable discipline regulations in their contracts. Like the problem of alcoholism and drug addition in teenagers, the lack of discipline may be a societal matter which is only spilling into the schools.

Also, in regard to discipline, the Bayh subcommittee report quoted results of a study which found that numerous institutions across the country have teachers, administrators, and students "embroiled in constant on-going disputes over restrictions on dress, hair style, smoking, hall passes, student newspapers and a myriad of other aspects of school life."

Attempts to control clothes and hair styles were actually taking a toll on the educative environment rather than enhancing it in many of the schools surveyed.[36]

Bronfenbrenner, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (in their statement at the CEDaR conference on school violence) and many others have noted that the world of adults and the "youth culture" are separate orientations. For years, the NEA has insisted upon improved student-teacher ratios to improve the instructional aspect of schools. Many believe an improved adolescent-adult ratio in schools might have a positive effect on student behavior. In the terms of McPartland and McDill, this would be an effort to enhance responsiveness through cost, in that it would be more likely that misbehavior would be observed and quickly and certainly dealt with. Logic would suggest that to isolate 1,300 adolescents in one big building over a nine-month period might result in widespread discipline problems for 200 adult supervisors.

Just as the Children's Defense Fund asserted that schools were applying the punishment of suspension arbitrarily and with a certain racial bias, Alan Levine of the New York Civil Liberties Union defended

the rights of students, which he feels schools routinely violate. Levine called for a free student press, fairer disciplinary procedures, and a guaranteed grievance process when students have complaints about school personnel and policies. He said:

> So long as there are thousands of students who enter school every year who will never graduate, and thousands who are inexplicably promoted but can barely read or write, and thousands who get tracked into classes in which little or no learning takes place, and thousands who are subjected to arbitrary and oppressive rules and the discriminatory enforcement of those rules, schools will continue to breed anger, resentment and frustration, and they will be places where violence may erupt at any time.[38]

Just as the isolation of adolescents away from adults may be bound to breed an unstable environment, so might that very situation be further intensified in alternative schools, Levine felt.

> Such facilities for students with so-called behavior problems have a long history in many school systems. Always they were to be places that would have specially-trained teachers, working with specially-designed materials in specially-designed curricula. Almost invariably, they have turned into dumping grounds for all the students nobody else wanted. Predictably the extra resources that were to make those facilities work were not forthcoming; financially pressed school systems are hardly likely to lavish limited monies on those students who have been labeled rejects.[39]

It has often been pointed out that the isolation of a student with discipline problems among a whole school population of children with discipline problems

and other learning impediments, unless handled very carefully and skillfully, can doom a child to a self-image of being a deviant and a life that is the self-fulfilling prophecy of that self-image. Undoubtedly, however, many alternative schools in this country do meet the standards originally envisioned and provide valuable learning alternatives.

Finally, there has been something repressive about the reporting procedure for school crimes which, in attitudes and tendencies of school administrators, resembles the age-old social anxiety of parents of unwed mothers. A teacher from Missouri stated in the Bayh subcommittee hearings that she was assaulted in her classroom, and the principal of her school hushed the matter up.[40] Similarly, when the subcommittee was collecting the data from the 757 school districts, several cooperated only on the condition that the data from their school systems remain secret. The entire matter of reporting school violence and vandalism reflects a certain attitude people have about the problem. The perplexing variability of definitions, data classification and collection methods, and record keeping makes it difficult to get an accurate national picture of what is going on. Records for average daily attendance, which are

connected to school funding, are far more conscientiously maintained. There is every indication that this problem will not go away until we fully understand it and begin talking about it, and we cannot understand it until some uniform classifications (it is actually less important that they be the exact "right" classifications than that they be uniform) are adopted. Even after we understand the problem, there is a long road ahead. But to suppress information or to block the effective collection of data is to become a part of the problem rather than the solution.

SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

Predictably, special interest groups have come forward from everywhere to suggest that they have research to indicate that their program helps solve the problem of violence and vandalism in the schools. Often the research is more a sales function than an attempt to discover the truth of the matter. This is not always the case, however. Many organizations and associations have labored long hours to discover incremental reforms and innovations and long-range methods to reduce the problem. In many cases the actual articulation of an identified cause is the suggestion for reform. For instance, once the grading system is identified as a problem in that it fails to meet the reward needs of a significant number of students, one can assume the schools should expand their reward system and perhaps reform the grading system so that it rewards a child's progress relative to him/herself rather than constantly comparing him or her to other students. In many cases, solutions do not get much more specific, and this is often a cause of frustration. The following is a presentation of solutions, all of which are incremental in scope, and most of which will take effort, imagination and, in some cases, money to

implement.

As community educators read through this list of solutions, they will see items which closely relate to practices firmly grounded in community education philosophy. Citizen involvement and student participation, agency interaction and the spirit of broad cooperation are widely recognized as important aspects of any effective solution addressing violence and vandalism, in schools or on the street. In more and more communities around the nation, community leaders and school administrators are turning to community education to address this huge problem in their locales. The community education philosophy and practice will carry community education practitioners a long way, but eventually the job becomes a matter of imagination and creativity, as well as of applying proven techniques. At that time, it is hoped the following suggested solutions will be of help.

Suggested immediate security measures. In the debate over solutions, none is more heated than the discussion of "process" solutions versus the whole range of security measures. McPartland and McDill seem to effectively pose the crux of the matter: "They say security hardware reduces the cost of

vandalism. The question is what amount of savings through decreased vandalism and increased safety measures justifies what level of expenditures?"[40] Weighing the question of security steps versus long-range "process" answers, Dr. Harvey Scribner, former Chancellor of New York City schools, may have sounded the sanest compromise by insisting that the question is not an either/or matter but rather an issue of where the emphasis is to be placed. The following suggestions are representative of the vast number of practical short-range solutions school people around the country are implementing:

- *to combat violence and vandalism from individuals not enrolled, limit entrance and exits for normal use and institute an ID check system run by students; in extreme cases, the system could be run by a police-person or security guard.*

- *90% reduction in off-hours school vandalism has been reported with the use of sophisticated new intrusional alarm motion detection devices.*

- *several school systems have provided an on-grounds mobile home unit free of charge in exchange for watching the school plant in off-hours.*

- *several urban school systems have been forced to use the extreme measure of having a police observer hovering in a helicopter above the school playground, in constant communication with earth-bound police.*

- *roving police patrols have been used in many urban schools, and many schools even outside the urban centers have resorted to continuous*

police presence in the school building.

- ground floor window grilling prevents many break-ins during off-hours.

- security lighting of outside school areas and isolated indoor "trouble spots" has proven effective in many school systems.

- undercover security personnel have been resorted to in systems in which drugs and prostitution marketing are carried on in school halls.

- in some schools a police officer has been assigned to the school in an effort to improve police rapport with students so that students will be more inclined to report misbehavior, vandalism, etc. This police-person is more in the nature of a school-police relations liaison than a security guard.

- schools in which there are racial tensions might try hall patrols with, for instance, a black and a white student working together.

- schools which are in dangerous or unstable neighborhoods might consider the "safety street" concept, in which a high security street leading to school is instituted; maximum police and student volunteer efforts are exerted to guarantee the safety of anyone walking to school on this street.

- Harvard's Architectural Research Office recommends changes in the school plant which will accommodate the need for non-malicious damage such as graffiti, accidental glass breakage and "attractive nuisances" such as various kinds of protruding hardware.

- also in the line of architecture, for systems considering building new schools, there is a whole study of architecture which anticipates the problem of vandalism.

- one school which conducted programs twenty-four hours a day but which found it too expensive to pay for a continuing police

presence offered to the police department continuing use of its weight room and gymnasium facilities and in that way got police traffic in the hallways of the school.

These types of measures go as far as the imagination of concerned citizens are willing to take them. The entire area of tightening security in the schools is repulsive to some. Psychologists Craig Haney and Philip Zimbardo found in their study that vandalism and destruction may at times represent attacks against an obvious symbol of the oppression of youth.[41] Marian Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund was concerned that the massive publicity about school violence would bring about an extreme reaction, converting schools into armed camps - an atmosphere hardly more educative than the one which prevails today.[42] Still, it is clear that, in some schools in some settings, immediate and firm security action must be taken, and the caution against overreaction is simply part of the job of a responsible administrator who seeks to return order to the hallways of his or her school.

Beyond the immediate, short-range necessity of security measures is an entire frontier of long-range considerations. The community educator will recognize these solutions as the "process" orientation.

Suggested long-range process measures. Inherent in the concept of process, and probably the aspect of it which makes it a long-range matter, is its dependence on attitude change. There has been wide recognition of the fact that, some time ago, Americans suddenly began to feel like strangers to the very institutions which were serving them. It was abruptly realized that government had evolved out of the principle of being of, by and for the people and was somehow operating separately from the mainstream of American life. When involvement of citizens in national processes returned once again as a guiding principle, it was discovered that both the institutions and the citizens involved were rusty. In the 1960's the participatory process received vast publicity and widespread recognition, but for the most part, in retrospect, involvement was somewhat of a token nature. It was clear that considerable attitude change was going to have to take place before the process realized its potential in the democracy. The following suggested measures represent a renewed faith in the principle of participation and broad involvement applied to the problem of school violence and vandalism:

- *beginning with an activist example, a Missouri teacher testified to the Bayh subcommittee that violence and vandalism were out of hand in her school and the administration was not recognizing the problem; she organized a strike that took the form of a "dialogue day" in which the teachers in the school stopped teaching and began talking about the problem with each other, with the community, with the media and eventually with the administrators.*

- *a massive effort teaming village trustees, a PTA task force on school vandalism, and school district administrators managed to fund, on an experimental basis, a project in which pilot schools received a dollar for each student enrolled - this money was to be spent in repairing the work of vandals during the school year, and whatever remained of the money at the end was to be spent according to the wishes of the students; students immediately organized to minimize vandalism and determine through broad involvement how the money would be spent. Vandalism was abruptly reduced, and the project was adopted system-wide (South San Francisco Unified School District).*

- *an NEA resolution on the problem of vandalism called for local teachers, parents and students to work together designing and evaluating a code of behavior for schools, then enforcing it.*

- *by means of daytime adult education classes, volunteer programs and the centering of certain community services in the school, the problem of the segregation of age groups has been addressed by improving the adolescent-adult ratio in the schools.*

- *Whatever system of discipline is adopted, it must be fairly, consistently and steadily enforced; and it must be published, distributed and understood by every person whose day is spent in the schools.*

- *if there is a violence problem in the schools, parents should immediately be alerted formally by the administration instead of finding out by community rumor; this school-community communication is the first step toward a solution, and is easier if the school the community have steadily communicated prior to an emergency.*

- *however, only alerting the parents is not enough; they must be engaged in the task of determining and implementing necessary changes, including establishing alternative curricula.*

- *the communication lines open, the community can be a resource to solving the school violence problem and the school can fully reciprocate by becoming a forum for determining appropriate changes to improve the situation in the community (the assumption being that a serious school violence and vandalism problem rarely exists in the vacuum of a community free of these problems).*

- *in order to broaden the responsiveness of the school, various reward systems should be instituted in schools where only a minority of students excel academically.*

- *various decision-making functions should exist for students in schools in order to widen the student sense of access, hence ownership, in the school; these functions might be administrative, curricular, and/or in regard to extra-curriculars, and might also include involvement with the community advisory council in community as well as in school matters; not only does this enhance the responsiveness of the school, but it also trains a generation of future community members in the art and skill of involvement in a participatory democracy.*

- *schools must come to a new recognition of student rights if students are ever to come to a recognition of the importance of schools; the importance of due process in disciplinary matters cannot be overemphasized.*

- *schools should begin to accept the necessity to free up the student press in order that students can understand the responsibilities and burdens of freedom rather than laboring and resisting under the weight of over-guidance and restriction.*

- *teachers with good rapport among students should be enlisted to keep in relatively constant touch with school drop-outs, keeping the lines of communication open between drop-outs and the school.*

- *involvement especially of bored and reactive students should be enlisted in school-community efforts to design innovations to meet the needs of bored and reactive students.*

- *in secondary schools, special problems classes might be offered in which teachers with good rapport and expertise in group dynamics and the handling of aggression open up critical local and school issues for dialogue as a learning experience - community invited.*

- *grading might be individualized rather than relentlessly relegating certain individuals to the lower end of a statistical bell-curve.*

- *several students, teachers and community members might be formed into crisis intervention teams, with training being a matter for credit for involved students.*

- *punishments for infractions should be a matter of real cost to guilty students; to suspend a chronic truant is a punishment without appropriate cost; parents should always be involved in the determination of what an appropriate punishment is - in many cases, the involvement of the parents in itself provides ample cost (remember that "cost" here is being used after the work of McPartland and McDill and does not mean specifically a matter of money, although sometimes making a student pay for damages is appropriate punishment.)*

- *vocational education and alternative education should be conducted in a school system free of pejorative implications; these should not be institutions for segregating away students who deviate, but should exist to broaden the curricular variety available to all students.*

- *through the community advisory council and other avenues of community involvement, cooperative relationships with business and industry and government should be set up in order to provide community-based learning opportunities.*

- *schools should maintain a liaison with the juvenile courts.*

- *in the long run, schools should begin to consider returning to smaller school plants and smaller student populations under a single-house roof; in the meantime, school staff attention should be given to combating the anonymity and impersonalness of large schools.*

- *in a certain sense, the confrontation of diverse groups of educators and other community members with problems is a process solution in itself; wherever there is involvement on a wide scale, there is shared responsibility, a sense of community, the power of synergy and the opening of communication lines, all of which serve to solve problems of the present and lay the solid groundwork for quickly finding solutions to problems which are not yet foreseen.*

- *there is considerable evidence that some of a child's most important years are in his or her pre-school life; it is fully within the realm of a community educator to help in bridging the gap between the school and the home. Especially in cases in which there is evidence of instability at home or difficulties in parenting, certain programs could be instituted on the order of a kind of "home-bound kindergarten," in which the teacher and the parent*

work together in the child's home in order to make the best of those crucial developmental years. In this kind of a program, the effort is as much to help the parent in teaching the child as in teaching the child directly, so that the child's learning can go on even when the teacher is not present. If it is the goal to improve the entire environment for people, in the field of community education, surely the home is as proper an area to give attention to change as is the school or community - and in the case of violence and vandalism, there is a demonstrated and documented benefit to making those early years good ones for a child.

- *the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended that pilot projects be established encouraging selected neighborhood parents to be trained, qualified and employed as teachers in the home.*

- *one task for a community advisory council might be to get teachers and parents to sit down and determine ways of using the home as a learning environment.*

- *in keeping with the above point that children's early years are very important in regard to self-esteem as well as academic competence, schools should begin to entertain shifting monetary and other resource emphases from high school to early elementary years.*

- *there is an entire field of thought surrounding reality based curricula. A reality-based alternative education model might be suggested in which learning is concretized by real-world glimpses, which are reasons in themselves for why certain things are taught in school. This curriculum would demonstrate the relevance of school curricula while providing a context for learning. As has been pointed out, however, it is important that such an alternative school as this have a*

general school population and is not limited to the bored, reactive or "problem" student.

- *it has been pointed out that most vandalism of major proportions takes place between 4 p.m. and 7 p.m. Extended use of the facility, twelve months a year, seven days a week, and in the evenings, reduces the time when the school is dark and vulnerable. Action on this point in many school districts might require a look at statutes and laws, some very archaic, which pertain to school use.*

- *the whole school community must be involved in the search for education dollars and for solutions to education and community problems which cost little or nothing.*

- *in certain cases students might be encouraged to leave school if they have considered the significance of the step, and the schools and the community should have a procedure for helping such a person find his or her way outside the school, whether it be by providing continuing counseling or by helping him or her make the best of his or her days outside of school; again, this is a matter of increased school responsiveness.*

Community Education and Juvenile Delinquency:

Sunnyvale. Because many specific concentrations in community education programs and processes have been identified as helpful in the effort to curb school violence and vandalism, many school districts are turning to community education precisely for reasons of confronting local problems of delinquency and school vandalism. An example is the case of Sunnyvale, California.[43] In 1971 a viable, successful Sunnyvale community schools program, "looking to

expand," sent off a proposal to the California Council on Criminal Justice. The proposal, entitled "The Action Model to Combat Juvenile Delinquency," was funded for three years, focusing on North Sunnyvale.

The goals were (1) to form a positive sense of community, (2) operate programs to prevent youth crime, (3) enlist widespread community and agency support in deterring delinquency, (4) reduce vandalism, truancy and school suspensions, and (5) divert problem teenagers from the juvenile justice system.

In achieving these goals, John Gee, coordiantor of the Sunnyvale project, emphasized the importance of the philosophy shared by the six school directors and eight part-time college students who staffed the effort.

> The role of the director is defined as an "organizer", a community energizer. Programs are tools, almost gimmicks, to create communication through involvement. People discover that they have a lot in common. Community is built this way . . . There is no "How to do it" manual on building a community. The goal is taken as the terminal result. People are asked to chart the results needed, step by step, to reach this final result . . . Community School philosophy demands collective action and shared responsibility. People work together as equals with different roles. Decision-making is not placed in the hands of a few. When the problem is identified, tasks are divided up among everyone. People provide service for each other.[44]

The results in North Sunnyvale were significant:

- *33% reduction in vandalism while it was rising in neighboring schools.*

- *26% reduction in referrals to juvenile probation department compared to 16.3% reduction in the rest of the county.*

- *a special program for those averaging less than 50% attendance brought their attendance to an average 83%, and the high school adopted that special program on a permanent basis.*

- *prior to the community school program, suspensions were at an annual 112; in the second year of the program, suspensions were under 50.*

- *students were involved in initiation, supervision and grievance handling; fights in the school were reduced from 3 per day to 4 per month.*

- *cost benefit: cost for a director and support, $24,800; benefit, $68,000.*

But more important than the statistics were the intangible benefits, the individual success stories, the changing of an individual community's concept of itself.

Henry Daniels and John Palmer have documented vandalism reduction through community education in urban Dade County, Florida and rural Alma, Michigan respectively. We know from intuition and word of mouth that community education projects are helping communities and schools out of the problem of various kinds of school crime in Wheeling, West Virginia; Fairfax, Virginia; the Upper Peninsula, Michigan; Aurora, Colorado; and the list goes on and on.

In every case you read and hear about, the inevitable basic item in the effectiveness of these programs is the involvement of people. As community educators, we have to remember that it is that involvement, whether you call it community education or something else, that gets the job done. There is no evidence in the literature that anything will be accomplished if a school system or a school community enbraces the philosophy and concept of community education and takes on the name of community education without taking on the practice - hard-core participation by a broad base of the community in real decision-making and problem-solving.

Currently in community education, much research is being provided by community education interns and graduate fellows. While this research is desperately needed, it is generally attitudinal, somewhat descriptive, often very narrow and academic. Another kind of research is also needed, and it can best be accomplished by documentation of successes and failures by community educators coordinating and directing programs in the field. This information could be disseminated through various NCEA publications so that other community educators can benefit from the experience. This sort of activity is going on right

now, but it could take place on a much broader scale to everyone's benefit.[45]

The Matter of Legislation. In the federal picture, "The Safe Schools Act" was introduced in 1971 as H.R. 10641, and again in 1972 as H.R. 2650 (with a companion measure introduced in the Senate as S. 485). Basically the bill was a security-oriented law, providing for improved training for school security people, funds for the latest exotic security hardware, funding for student identification systems and training for "parent patrols" in order to increase adult presence in the schools. Many schools desperately needed this kind of legislation. No further action was taken after a few hearings in 1971 and a few more in 1972. It was only when the "Safe Schools Study Act" was submitted that action was taken. This legislation became part of the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974," H.R. 69. The "Safe Schools Study Act" was more a "study" act than a "safe schools" act. The questions which come to mind are, "If this study is necessary, what good was the study conducted by the Bayh judiciary subcommittee?" and "When can we expect 'safe schools' legislation?" The "safe schools study" is to be submitted to Congress by December 1, 1976. The

question which may be in the minds of legislators, and perhaps explains some of the hesitancy to ask, is "Can you lick the problem of school violence and vandalism with money?" There are arguments on all sides of these points, but the basic thing that comes through is that a community educator who wants to confront these problems in his or her school community has many initial steps s/he can take with local resources, and s/he need not hold his or her breath for federal support.

Many states, notably Florida (the Bayh subcommittee preliminary report calls Florida's "Safe Schools Act" the most comprehensive of all), have school security legislation. Characterized by money for fines and rewards, further study and school security hardware, these acts are generally similar in direction to the ill-fated H.R. 10641. Florida, however, is now drafting legislation which will expand, perhaps even change the basic thrust of, their "Safe Schools Act" in order to incorporate innovative programs. Perhaps the wisdom of Florida's experience will be reflected in the December 1 "Safe Schools Study Act" report to the U. S. Congress.

In the meantime, community educators might consider looking to juvenile justice programs for funding. These provisions differ from state to state.

A FINAL COMMENT

One of the errors of the Great Society was the unrealistic heightening of expectations. There is no need to do that here. Possibly, some schools and communities are embroiled in such a tangle of societal and organizational disasters that even vast initiatives of leadership, money and imagination might not improve the situation in the impact zone. There is the example of the West Coast urban school which experiences 100 percent turnover in a single year. There is the example of the industrial city which, from time to time, experiences a nearly 50 percent unemployment rate. Similar difficult situations exist throughout the country. It would be understandable if the list of solutions as presented here would seem almost useless in such situations.

The implications communities such as that have for the viability of our national system and our culture in the nation's third century would provide considerable material for a very sobering look. In the meantime, it is safe to assume realistically that just as cultures rise and fall, so do communities, so do school systems, so do statistics; and the height

of the rise and depth of the fall generally depend on the willingness and ability of the populations involved to steer their own course and the willingness and ability of their leadership to let them.

Footnotes

1. These statistics are all derived from the Preliminary Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, based on Investigations, 1971-75, including their survey which covered 1970-73. It is a 40-page document, exceedingly informative, if somewhat political, in places. This document, transcripts of depositions from the hearings and the committee's voluminous final report (released after preparation of this pamphlet), can be acquired by writing to the following address:

   Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency
   Room A504
   U. S. Senate
   Washington, D. C. 20510

2. Preliminary Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, p. 3.

3. Ibid, pp. 15-34.

4. Ibid., pp. 1-15

5. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of J. William Rioux, p. 3.

6. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Mrs. Walter Kimmel, p. 5.

7. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Marian Wright Edelman, pp. 1-7.

8. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Alan Levine, p. 5.

9. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Joseph I. Grealy, pp. 14-20.

10. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Robert E. Phay, pp. 3-9.

11. CEDaR Conference Abstracts, National School Board Association, pp. 12-13.

12. Preliminary Report, p. 8.

13. "Who's Raising the Kids?", Newsweek (September 22, 1975), p. 48.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid

20. Ibid., p. 50

21. These notes were taken from Wolfgang's talk at the CEDaR Conference. Also see his The Measurement of Delinquency and his The Subculture of Violence.

22. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of the NEA, p. 4.

23. Preliminary Report, p. 14.

24. The contribution of McPartland and McDill at the CEDaR Conference was immeasurable. Their major paper "Research on Crime in the Schools" is incisive and exhaustive. The above paper and others presented at the conference will be compiled, and publication is planned.

25. Ibid., p. 4.

26. Ibid., p. 5

27. Ibid., p. 6

28. Ibid., p. 27.

29. Ibid., p. 16

30. Ibid., p. 19

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., p. 22.

33. Ibid., p. 25. Also at the CEDaR Conference, Michael Marvin sounded considerable concern for school size. His organization, funded through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration at Research for Better Schools, Inc., has studied the problem of violence and vandalism in depth. For information:

    Research for Better Schools, Inc.
    1700 Market Street
    Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 79103

34. Preliminary Report, p. 8.

35. Ibid., p. 3.

36. Ibid., p. 11.

37. Notes from Marvin's talk, CEDaR Conference.

38. Subcommittee hearings, Levine, p. 8.

39. Ibid., p. 7.

40. Subcommittee hearings, Testimony of Peggy T. Cochran, p. 4.

41. Haney and Zimbardo (1975).

42. Subcommittee hearings, Edelman, p. 5.

43. John S. Gee, Crime Prevention Review (July, 1974). All subsequent statistics and information on Sunnyvale are derived from this well-written report.

44. Ibid., p. 27.

45. Rossi (1972) has interesting things to say about action research. The Gee article in Crime Prevention Review is a case in point.

NCEA Committee on School Violence and Vandalism

Members

Linda Hartwig
Assistant Director, Community Service Council
Romeoville, Illinois

David Wilkinson
Director, Community Education
Indiana State Department
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dr. John Palmer
Director, Community Education and Recreation
Alma Public Schools
Alma, Michigan

Dr. Donald Weaver
Director, Mott Foundation Advanced Training Programs
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Dr. Michael Kaplan
Assistant Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, U. Va
Charlottesville, Virginia

Albert Stefurak
Center for Community Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Philip Deaver, Committee Chairman
Mott Fellow
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, U. Va
Charlottesville, Virginia

N.C.E.A. -- PUBLICATIONS AND SERVICES A "MUST" FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Your membership in N.C.E.A. provides the following:

* N.C.E.A. News
* Community Education Today
* Legislative Update
* Community Education Research Bulletin
* Job Information Service
* Special Publications; Legislative Update; Affiliate Newsletter; Direct Line and Other Occasional Flyers
* National Convention
* Program Evaluation and Consultative Services
* Regional Conference and Focus Oriented Seminars
* Membership Directory

For a current listing of all available publications (written and audio-visual) and services, write to:

NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1017 AVON ST. • FLINT, MICHIGAN 48503 • 313-234-1634

THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION is an organization for people interested in the development of Community Education. Besides offering services to professionals in the field of Community Education, NCEA is open to all interested persons from all walks of life. NCEA believes that the concept of Community Education can only be realized through the full participation of all people in their communities. Founded in 1966, NCEA is dedicated to the expansion and advancement of Community Education.

PHILOSOPHY

The Board of Directors of the National Community School Education Association at their meeting of April 26, 1968, adopted the following statement on the philosophy of Community School Education:

Community School Education is a comprehensive and dynamic approach to public education. It is a philosophy that pervades all segments of education programming and directs the thrust of each of them towards the needs of the community. The Community School serves as a catalytic agent by providing leadership to mobilize community resources to solve identified community problems. This marshalling of all forces in the community helps to bring about change as the school extends itself to all people.

Community School Education either affects all children, youth and adults directly or it helps to create an atmosphere and environment in which all people find security and self confidence, thus enabling them to grow and mature in a community which sees its schools as an integral part of community life.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1017 AVON ST. • FLINT, MICHIGAN 48503 • 313-234-1634

Join Us !!!

N.C.E.A. PUBLICATION &
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

(Please Print or Type)

NAME _____ POSITION _____

HOME ADDRESS _____ PHONE _____
(Number) (Street) Area Number

_____
(City) (State) (Zip Code) (Social Security Number)

BUSINESS ADDRESS _____ PHONE _____
(Number) (Street)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

Send mail to: ☐ HOME ☐ BUSINESS Membership year July 1 June 30
(Check Membership Desired)

☐ Life Membership – $400 ☐ Institutional Membership – $100 ☐ **Active Membership – $30**
☐ Associate Membership – $10 ☐ Student Membership – $5 Please return this application with payment.
☐ Enclosed please find payment in full
☐ Please bill my office

CREDIT _____ for soliciting my membership.
(name)

NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1017 Avon Street Flint, Michigan 48503 A.C. (313) 234-1634